

United States Patent and Trademark Office



PAPER NUMBER

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,141	12/10/1999	YUEH YALE MA	M-7947-US	1972
7590	08/12/2003			

BARMAK S SANI TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 95111-3834 EXAMINER

LEE, EUGENE

ART UNIT 2815

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		son.			
	Application No.	blicant(s)			
	09/467,141	MA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
'	Eugene Lee	2815			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 M	<u>May 2003</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allows					
closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-18,21-29 and 37 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18,21-29 and 37</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			
LS Patent and Trademark Office					

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/467,141

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1 thru 4, 7 thru 18, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being 2. unpatentable over Kohda et al. '999 in view of Tigelaar '926. Kohda discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3A) an EPROM cell (cell structure) comprising impurity regions (first and second junction) 2/3, channel region, first and second floating gates 4a/4b, control gate (select-gate) 6, interlayer insulation films 7a/7b, gate insulation film 8 and substrate (body region) 1. The operation of the cell is determined by the voltages applied to the source, drain, substrate and control gate. Regarding claim 26, see FIG. 7. Kohda does not disclose the select-gate extending across the entire length of each of the first and second junctions. However, Tigelaar discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3e) a memory cell comprising a source region (first junction) 74, drain region (second junction) 76, channel 72, floating gate elements (first and second floating gates) 60a/60b, control gate (select-gate) 90, and insulation layer (insulating layer) 80. The control gate 90 extends across the entire length of the source and drain region. The control gate serves as a column line that accesses the memory cells of an array. See, for example, column 5, lines 25-39 of Tigelaar. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the select-gate extend across the entire length of each of the first and second junctions in order to form a column line that can access the memory cells of an array.

Application/Control Number: 09/467,141 Page 3

Art Unit: 2815

Claims 5, 6, 21 thru 24, 27 thru 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohda et al. '999 in view of Tigelaar '926 as applied to claims 1 thru 4, 7 thru 18, 25, and 26 above, and further in view of Guterman '691. Kohda in view of Tigelaar does not disclose the first and second floating having at least one slanted surface forming a sharp edge. However, Guterman shows (see, for example, FIG . _1) an EEPROM memory device comprising a floating gate 120, programming electrode 110 and tunneling element 101. Guterman teaches (see, for example, column 4, lines 19-42) that microtexturing the floating gate will enhance the local electric field and facilitate tunneling at lower voltages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have at least one slanted surface forming a sharp edge in the floating gates of Kohda in view of Tigelaar so that one can enhance the tunneling of electrons from the floating gate through the insulation film to the control gate.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, the floating gates being bowl-shaped does not provide any critical or unexpected results to the cell structure's operation. Rather, it is merely an obvious design choice determinable by routine experimentation. In *Aller*, the court stated, "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it in not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F. 2d 454, 456 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1995).

Application/Control Number: 09/467,141

Art Unit: 2815

Response to Arguments

Page 4

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 2, second paragraph that the patent drafteee of the Tigelaar et al. patent mistakenly matched up control gates 90 in FIG. 5e with column lines 16 in Fig. 1 instead of with row lines 12, and conversely mistakenly matched up source and drain regions with row lines 12 instead of column lines 16, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant has not shown any evidence why this is a drafting error except stating "It is notoriously well known in this art that in semiconductor memory arrays, gates of memory cells form row lines which are coupled to a row decoder, and drain and source regions of memory cells form column lines which are coupled to a column decoder." Therefore, the statement carries no weight. However, even if this statement were true, row lines and column lines are functionally and structurally identical to each other that it would make no difference whether the control gates were matched with either row lines or column lines.

Regarding the applicant's argument on page 3, middle paragraph that extending control gate 6 over drain and source regions 2, 3 prevents column lines from contacting the drain and source regions, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tigelaar clearly shows (see FIG. 3e) control gates 90 that extend over drain and source regions 74, 76 without contacting the drain and source regions. Therefore the same structure that is shown in Tigelaar may be applied to Kohda by having Kohda's control gate extend over drain and source regions without contacting the drain and source regions.

Application/Control Number: 09/467,141

Art Unit: 2815

Regarding the applicant's argument on page 3, last paragraph that the source and drain regions would no longer be self-aligned to the edges of control gate 6 and make the cell susceptible to process misalignments, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The edges of the source and drain regions may be aligned to the control gate by various methods that do not misalign the control gate and source and drain regions. For example, the vertical nature of the control gate 6 may be laid down which aligns the source and drain regions. Afterwards, the horizontal nature of the control gate may be laid down without affecting the alignment between the source and drain regions and the control gate.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/467,141

Art Unit: 2815

INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 703-305-5695. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on 703-308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular

communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Eugene Lee

August 7, 2003

B. WILLIAM BAUMEISTER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6

& mit